

A regular meeting of the Board of Aldermen was held Tuesday, February 23, 2016, at 7:30 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

President Brian S. McCarthy presided; City Clerk Patricia D. Piecuch recorded.

Prayer was offered by City Clerk Patricia D. Piecuch; Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr. led in the Pledge to the Flag.

The roll call was taken with members of the Board of Aldermen present; Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire and Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja were recorded absent.

Corporation Counsel Stephen M. Bennett was also present.

REMARKS BY THE MAYOR – None

RESPONSE TO REMARKS OF THE MAYOR – None

RECOGNITION PERIOD – None

READING MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN MCGUINNESS THAT THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN MEETINGS OF FEBRUARY 10, AND FEBRUARY 16, 2016, AND THE PUBLIC HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY THE HUMAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016, BE ACCEPTED, PLACED ON FILE, AND THE READINGS SUSPENDED**  
**MOTION CARRIED**

COMMUNICATIONS

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD THAT ALL COMMUNICATIONS BE READ BY TITLE ONLY**  
**MOTION CARRIED**

From: Marylou Blaisdell, Chair, Downtown Improvement Committee  
Re: Downtown Improvement Committee – Final Budget for Surplus Downtown  
Parking Funds Generated during Calendar Year 2014

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE AND REFER TO THE BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**MOTION CARRIED**

From: Larry D. Goodhue, Chief Executive Officer  
Re: Pennichuck Subsidiaries – Request for Approval of Loans from the  
New Hampshire Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund Program

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN MORIARTY TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE AND REFER TO THE PENNICHUCK WATER SPECIAL COMMITTEE**  
**MOTION CARRIED**

From: Larry D. Goodhue, Chief Executive Officer  
Re: Pennichuck East Utility, Inc. – Request for Approval of Loan with CoBank, ACB

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN MORIARTY TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE AND REFER TO THE PENNICHUCK WATER SPECIAL COMMITTEE**  
**MOTION CARRIED**

PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT RELATIVE TO ITEMS EXPECTED TO BE ACTED  
UPON THIS EVENING

Mr. Jim Tollner, Police Commissioner, Nashua Police Department

This is about the police supervisor's contract. When we look at the contract it's always a tough pill for the Board of Aldermen as we work on the financials for the city. I would like to take a moment to recognize the work that the supervisor's do in the Nashua Police Department. Like a lot of cities Nashua finds itself addressing heightened aggression and dealing with a variety of issues. The science of policing has become something with many moving parts and this dynamic has become something that our supervisors have shouldered with great success. I would just ask that in recognition of this that you support the police supervisor's contract this evening. Thank you very much.

Deputy Chief Michael Carignan, Nashua Police Department

I'm here tonight representing Andrew Lavoie who is on vacation and unable to attend. Chief Lavoie wanted to be here tonight with me to show support for this contract which is in front of you involving the Nashua Police supervisor's in the city. I've been working on this contract for the last eight months. I've been working hard with the team of supervisor's who have always recognized the need for fiscal responsibility and the limitations placed on me to negotiate certain portions of this contract. I believe the contract represents their professionalism, their accountability and their leadership in bringing about the highest possible standards for every Nashua police officer which is something that I expect and you all deserve. The chief and I believe strongly that we can work this contract into the FY '17 guidelines that were presented to us last week. The chief and I would both like to thank you for your support and your consideration.

Sergeant Keith Dillon, Nashua Police Department

I am also the President of the Nashua Police Supervisor's Union. First I would like to thank you for your consideration in this matter and secondly I would like to state that members of the union understand that financial decisions are often difficult and the members of the union believe in fiscal responsibility as well and that's why we believe that this is a fair contract that is just on both sides. The union is comprised of dedicated professionals who have over the years demonstrated their commitment to the safety and the welfare of the residents of Nashua and to provide the highest level of service. The Nashua Police Department's supervisor's union also believes that this is one of the Board's highest priorities as well. We believe this contract helps to ensure that the City of Nashua will retain those qualified professionals and be able to continue to provide a high level of safety and the protection of the future.

Mr. Bernie Cote, 22 Granley Street

I am here to talk about Charron Avenue which you people are intending to do and I don't understand why. I've lived in Nashua all of my life and I know that I'm older than any one of you in here. It's never been a problem and I don't know why you people want to get rid of that little jig about because it takes only about two or three minutes to do it. You people are looking to spend over \$1 million and lately that's all that is being done in this city is money, money, money. Well, what are we getting? We are getting nothing. Thank you.

PETITIONS – None

NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS AND ELECTIONS

Joint Convention with the Board of Library Trustees

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS THAT THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN MEET IN JOINT CONVENTION  
WITH THE BOARD OF LIBRARY TRUSTEES FOR THE PURPOSE OF ELECTING A TRUSTEE  
MOTION CARRIED**

*President McCarthy called for nominations.*

Trustee Barrett nominated Holly Klump for a term to expire March 31, 2023.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN COOKSON TO CLOSE NOMINATIONS**  
**MOTION CARRIED**

A Viva Voce Roll Call vote was taken on the appointment of Holly Klump to the Board of Library Trustees for a term to expire March 31, 2023, which resulted as follows:

Yea: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane, Alderman Cookson, 18  
Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron, Alderman Siegel,  
Alderman Schoneman, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun,  
Alderman Moriarty, Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez,  
Alderman McCarthy, Trustee Arthur Barrett, Jr., Trustee Pauline Desautels,  
Trustee Holly Klump, Trustee Linda LaFlame, Trustee David K. Pinsonneault

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

President McCarthy declared Holly Klump duly appointed to the Board of Library Trustees for a term to expire March 31, 2023.

Oath of Office administered by Corporation Counsel Stephen Bennett.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CARON THAT THE CONVENTION NOW ARISE**  
**MOTION CARRIED**

*Appointments by the Mayor*

The following appointments by the Mayor were read into the record:

Cultural Connections Committee

Rafael Calderon (New Appointment) For a Term to Expire: February 28, 2018  
394 Notre Dame Avenue  
Manchester, NH 03102

Sylvia E. Gale (New Appointment) For a Term to Expire: February 28, 2018  
4 Clergy Circle  
Nashua, NH 03064

Deepa Mangalat (New Appointment) For a Term to Expire: February 28, 2019  
18 Wild Rose Drive  
Nashua, NH 03063

Director of Public Health

Bobbie Bagley (New Appointment) Indefinite Term at the Pleasure of the Mayor  
17 Bunker Hill Drive  
Londonderry, NH 03053

Downtown Improvement Committee

Simon Sarris (New Appointment)  
23 Auburn Street  
Nashua, NH 03064

For a Term to Expire: December 13, 2016

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO ACCEPT THE APPOINTMENTS BY THE MAYOR AS  
READ AND REFER THEM TO THE PERSONNEL/ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
MOTION CARRIED**

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Budget Review Committee ..... 02/18/16

There being no objection, President McCarthy declared the report of the February 18, 2016  
Budget Review Committee accepted and placed on file.

Finance Committee..... 02/17/16

There being no objection, President McCarthy declared the report of the February 17, 2016  
Finance Committee accepted and placed on file.

Human Affairs Committee ..... 02/16/16

There being no objection, President McCarthy declared the report of the February 16, 2016  
Human Affairs Committee accepted and placed on file.

Substandard Living Conditions Special Committee..... 02/11/16

There being no objection, President McCarthy declared the report of the February 11, 2016  
Substandard Living Conditions Special Committee accepted and placed on file.

WRITTEN REPORTS FROM LIAISONS - None

CONFIRMATION OF MAYOR'S APPOINTMENTS – None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-16-002**

Endorsers: Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Benjamin M. Clemons  
Alderswoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman Tom Lopez

**APPROVING THE COST ITEMS OF A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE  
NASHUA BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE NASHUA TEACHERS' UNION, LOCAL 1044, AFT,  
AFL-CIO, UNIT B PARA-EDUCATORS FROM JULY 1, 2015, THROUGH JUNE 30, 2017, AND  
AUTHORIZING RELATED TRANSFERS**

Given its second reading;

President McCarthy

Before I ask for a motion I will point out that I will be recusing myself since my wife is covered by this  
bargaining unit and Alderman O'Brien will as well for the same reason.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-16-002**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Dowd

This was approved unanimously at the Budget Review Committee meeting the other night. It's a two-year contract covering the period of July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2017. It's a salary increase in year one of 1.5%, the salary increase in year two is 2% but delayed a half of year producing a 1% only increase in FY '17. The holiday for Martin Luther King Day was added but not until the end of the two-year contract and the high deductible medical plan was added to meet the requirements of the Affordable Care Act.

Alderman Moriarty

The upcoming spending cap is looking to be 1.3% and this particular contract, the first year bottom line total cost growth is 1.4% and in the second year it's 1.3%. I can't remember seeing a salary contract to come before me in the past four years that was this low so I am going to support this. It's within the spending cap and I like to encourage that sort of behavior.

A Viva Voce Roll Call vote was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea:	Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane, Alderman Cookson, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron, Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty, Alderman Lopez	11
------	--	----

Nay:		0
------	--	---

**MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-16-002 declared duly adopted.

**R-16-003**

Endorsers: Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Benjamin M. Clemons  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman Tom Lopez

**APPROVING THE COST ITEMS OF A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NASHUA BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE NASHUA TEACHERS' UNION, LOCAL 1044, AFT, AFL-CIO, UNIT D, FOOD SERVICE WORKERS FROM SEPTEMBER 1, 2015, THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2018**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-16-003**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Moriarty

For similar reasons I am going to support this contract. There may be some subtleties about how it's funded, it's self-funded anyway but regardless of that the costs are reasonable and they are in the low 1%'s so I'll take it.

**MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-16-003 declared duly adopted.

**R-16-004**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.

**RELATIVE TO THE APPROPRIATION OF \$9,282 FROM ACCOUNT #107-51 "CITY CLERK – SALARIES & WAGES" INTO NEW ACCOUNT #107-71 "CITY CLERK – EQUIPMENT" FOR THE PURCHASE OF A COLOR LASER PRINTER**

Given its second reading;

President McCarthy

I had made a motion at the Budget Review Committee meeting to change the title from "appropriation" to "transfer" because it really is a transfer. In a subsequent discussion with the legal department it is also an appropriation because the line item that the transfer goes into does not exist so we will be requiring a two-thirds vote and I would ask that the amendment from the committee not be moved forward because the original legislation was correct.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-16-004**

A Viva Voce Roll Call vote was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea:	Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane, Alderman Cookson, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron, Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty, Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy	13
------	--	----

Nay:		0
------	--	---

**MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-16-004 declared duly adopted.

**R-16-005**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Benjamin M. Clemons  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Tom Lopez

**RELATIVE TO THE ACCEPTANCE AND APPROPRIATION OF \$25,000 FROM THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY "STATE HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM" INTO EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GRANT ACTIVITY "2015 HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM"**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN SCHONEMAN FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-16-005  
MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-16-005 declared duly adopted.

**R-16-006**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.

**RELATIVE TO THE TRANSFER OF \$200,000 FROM DEPARTMENT 194 "CONTINGENCY",  
ACCOUNT #70100 "GENERAL CONTINGENCY" INTO VARIOUS ACCOUNTS FOR RETIREMENT  
AND UTILITY COSTS**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-16-006  
MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-16-006 declared duly adopted.

**R-16-007**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Tom Lopez

**RELATIVE TO THE ACCEPTANCE AND APPROPRIATION OF \$40,000 FROM THE STATE OF NEW  
HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES INTO PUBLIC HEALTH AND  
COMMUNITY SERVICES GRANT ACTIVITY "FY2016 AND FY2017 CLIMATE AND HEALTH  
ADAPTATION PLAN (CHAP)"**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CARON FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-16-007**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Siegel

I know normally we just sort of autopilot these acceptance of funds through, but in this particular case I'm going to take the unusual step to vote no. The reason is because although this is not directly city funded money, it is still money from the state. Quite honestly, I don't get it. It sounds really good but after all is said and done, I don't know what we actually produce from this or what the end result of this study or how the world changes. Nashua spends \$40,000. We do a study, and all of a sudden we're going to prevent cyclonic activity in the Pacific Ocean. I know it's probably a futile effort and everybody will vote for it anyway, but all money is not free.

Alderman Schoneman

Perhaps one of the sponsors can explain exactly what the product would be from this.

President McCarthy

Would anyone like to address that?

Alderman Clemons

I'll just say for the record that if it wasn't Nashua getting this grant, it would be somewhere else. I'm going to vote in favor of it regardless. That's just my opinion. Thank you.

Alderman Siegel

All I can say is bing, bing, bing. That's exactly the problem I'm trying to address. I understand that someone else will get it perhaps, but it's time for us to adopt an attitude that there's a limit to resources even though they appear to be coming from a state or federal tree. Sometimes grants that come our way are actually silly to have. We should start taking a closer look at them and have, I wouldn't call it the courage, but perhaps call it a little bit of the wisdom to say no occasionally if what's we're asked to be doing with this actually has no real positive effect that we can ascertain. Again, others may disagree but it's time to put a stick in the ground on this kind of spending.

A Viva Voce Roll Call vote was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea:	Alderman Clemons, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron, Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy	6
------	---	---

Nay:	Alderman Deane, Alderman Cookson, Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty	7
------	--	---

**MOTION FAILED**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO TABLE**

A Viva Voce Roll Call vote was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea:	Alderman Clemons, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron, Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy	6
------	---	---

Nay:	Alderman Deane, Alderman Cookson, Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty	7
------	--	---

**MOTION FAILED**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN SIEGEL FOR INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF R-16-007**

A Viva Voce Roll Call vote was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea:	Alderman Deane, Alderman Cookson, Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty	7
------	--	---

Nay:	Alderman Clemons, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron, Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy	6
------	---	---

Resolution R-16-007 declared indefinitely postponed.



**R-16-009**

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman Benjamin M. Clemons  
Alderswoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja

**APPROVING THE COST ITEMS OF A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN  
THE NASHUA POLICE COMMISSION AND THE NASHUA POLICE SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION  
FROM JULY 1, 2015 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2019 AND RELATED TRANSFERS**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-16-009**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Siegel

This is a contract I actually don't like at all, I think it's excessive. Unfortunately, it doesn't matter and the problem is that the 3% raise is "evergreen" so while we may not like it, the problem is if we vote against the contract it doesn't matter because that raise will be instituted anyway after it goes through arbitration or whatever process. The net effect will have been to take the contract and not approve it and potentially put it up for renegotiation in which case some of the givebacks can get back at us such as the named healthcare. Unfortunately we will have to pay the back wages anyway plus the incurred cost of the litigation should there be any. The major cost items of this contract are things that we literally have no control over so we can all do a hero's vote and say no but it won't ultimately matter and in fact in our zeal to try to be more fiscally responsible, as we should be, in this particular case it will actually end up costing us money. Separately, as you can imagine, it would demoralize the leadership of the police department although absent that "evergreen" clause I would be willing to take that chance for a better contract but it doesn't really matter because here we are. The rest of the cost items in here, for example, the holiday buy-back ends up being a net advantage strangely enough for the city because we will be purchasing vacation days at a lower rate of pay than they would be later on. On balance it really makes no sense not to vote against this if you have your fiscal hat on. It's because of the constraints that are placed on us because of the "evergreen" clause, absent that I think we could have a very different discussion.

Alderman Clemons

Thank goodness for "evergreen" clauses. I think that's one of the good things that the state did a few years ago, unfortunately it got repealed but I guess this contract must fall under that. That being said I think this is a good contract and I think that the supervisor's do excellent work in this city and I think that in order to keep that talent and get more talent you have to pay your employees well and recognize the work that they do. I think that this contract does both and I am proud to support it.

Alderman Dowd

I think also there was a major concession on the insurance. This was the last union to make that concession and it has a potential for a significant savings to the city.

Alderman Moriarty

I am going to disagree with Alderman Siegel. I agree that the contract is unaffordable but I disagree that our vote will have no impact. How do we know, we don't know that the clause could hold up in negotiation. We don't know which end of the mutually exclusive constraints are going to give and which one is going to take. We've had times on this Board when we've wanted to abdicate our ability to...the Board of Aldermen can still vote no, the contract can still be rejected resolving this mutually exclusive constraints that have been imposed on us and we can let somebody else deal with that problem. We can still vote no if we would like. Why would I encourage you to vote no and keep it simple for anybody who is not following the contorted legalities of various

inconsistent clauses of various contracts. The bottom line is that the spending cap is 1.3%. The size of the pie of the budget is 1.3%. Each slice of the pie can grow larger than the 1.3% but you can't have all of the slices of the pie grown larger than the pie itself. The spending cap is going to be 1.3% and the cost of this contract is 3.5% and then 4% the next year and then 4.4% and then 3.3%. It's two to three times the spending cap; it's totally out of control. I don't believe that voting no and rejecting it is not going to have an effect. I refuse to accept the fact that someone can write a clause in something and bind the Board of Aldermen hands to prevent us from being able to do our job. I refuse to accept that so I am going to keep it simple and vote no and let the lawyer's haggle over it.

Alderman Siegel

While I appreciate my colleagues concern and wish he had attended the Budget Review Committee meeting to address that where we had a more lengthy discussion, I am pretty confident in my ability to read a contract and understand the results of the contract negotiation. I also trust the legal departments' judgement on this and I also would point out that I spent a considerable amount of time meeting with Chief Lavoie, Deputy Chief Carignan and also Karen Smith. We went over the details because to be honest with you I walked into their office fully very upset about the contract and fully willing to explain my reason why there was no way I could support it. It's not like somebody sweet talked me into it, the unfortunate reality is what we are facing. Of course again, it's absolutely true, my colleague Alderman Moriarty is correct in that we are definitely free to vote however we want but to say let the chips fall where they may; the chips are going to fall naturally in the gravity of the legal system which will pull them towards an inevitable cost that we will incur plus and additional cost. It's not a good plan, I wish it were otherwise.

Alderman Cookson

I'm just looking for some guidance here. Unfortunately the Mayor isn't in attendance this evening. I wasn't able to attend the Budget Review Committee meeting but I did review the minutes and during the course of that interaction I believe it was Chief Lavoie who made a statement which referred to the guidance that they had received which wasn't within the spending cap but it was I believe 2.5%. My question and if corporation counsel has some information and would be able to share, I would be interested to know what additional guidance has the Mayor provided to other city departments with regard to how much budget they have to allocate? The police being 2.5%, I'm interested in the schools, DPW and other departments within the city.

Attorney Bennett

I have very limited information on that. I can tell you that the information that I saw was that the police would be asked to maintain their budget within a 2.5% increase; the school district within a 2.0% increase and all other departments at a 1.3%. While I have the floor for the last time, I just want to correct a couple of misconceptions. The "evergreen" clause does not really play a part in that; it continues a contract after it has supposed to expire so that the terms all apply. What you were talking about Alderman Siegel, was what we refer to as the "me too" clause which says in effect in the wages that if the patrolmen were to receive a higher percentage in any given year then the supervisor's would be entitled to that same percentage. The logic behind that and I'm not saying I am for that type of clause because it does limit negotiations quite a bit, is to prevent compression between the patrolmen and the master patrolmen and the sergeants and lieutenants. The thought being that there really isn't that much of a difference between the pay but there surely is in the responsibilities. You are not going to get people applying to move up the ladder if the pay isn't consistent with the added responsibilities.

Alderman Siegel

Thank you, Attorney Bennett; I think I was a little bit clearer at the Budget Review Committee meeting and I'm sorry to have messed that up but the net effect is the same.

Alderman Cookson

Thank you for that information, Attorney Bennett; so 2.5% is the guidance that was delivered to the police. You indicated that 2.0% to school and are you certain on that amount?

Attorney Bennett

I am pretty sure those are the amounts and the 1.3% for everybody else.

Alderman Cookson

So we are really close to that spending cap as you protract that across all of the different departments. So anywhere between 1.3% and 1.9% is the expected spending cap?

Attorney Bennett

My understanding is that it's closer to 1.3%.

Alderman Cookson

If it's closer to 1.3% we have to be very cautious about that. We have a Mayor who indicated in his campaign stomping last year that he wouldn't exceed the spending cap so I am assuming that he's working with CFO Griffin to make sure that all of these contracts that are going to be coming in that we will be able to afford and he's going to be able to keep his campaign promise. Attorney Bennett, you were the chief negotiator for the city, can we look at Article 24, Overtime? There seems to be a section that was added into this for time worked and this was only considered for the purpose of calculating overtime. It goes through a series of different categories, admin leave with pay; jury duty and personal time. All of these are taken into account when are considered time worked for the purpose of calculating overtime, is that correct?

Attorney Bennett

Yes.

Alderman Cookson

Admin leave with pay or suspended with pay, those two categories in particular, how would those be used to calculate overtime?

Attorney Bennett

If you are suspended with pay you are given credit for 8 hours per day.

Alderman Cookson

But you would never have overtime, would you, if you were suspended with pay or you were on admin leave with pay? How could you have overtime?

Attorney Bennett

I suspect if during the week you were suspended with pay for two days and came back to work that week that you had the opportunity to get overtime that same week.

Alderman Cookson

That's a possible explanation, thank you for that.

Attorney Bennett

It's the best guess I can give you.

Alderman Cookson

It's creative. Vacation, you can calculate overtime based on vacation? I just wish this would have been discussed more.

President McCarthy

I think, Alderman Cookson, what those are used for is to calculate the straight time that leads up to the total time after which vacation is approved overtime is approved. So if I've taken 5 days of vacation and I'm to my 40 hours for the week by the vacation and then I'm called into work the next day then that day counts as overtime because I have 40 hours that is already accounted for. I think that all of those things fall into that category essentially.

Alderman Cookson

None of these existed prior to this particular contract. How was overtime calculated prior to and why is this a benefit to this contract.

Attorney Bennett

In fact that's exactly how overtime has been calculated in the past. That is incorporating the process they used prior to this and they just put it into the contract this time.

Alderman Cookson

So they are just codifying it?

Attorney Bennett

Correct, they are not new categories, in fact the police UAW contract included the exact same categories under their overtime.

Alderman Dowd

This contract was approved unanimously at the Budget Review Committee. Also the last time that the patrolmen's contract came through the similar raises were approved because we were having trouble retaining police officers and the cost of replacing them was excessively high because all of the surrounding communities were paying more, at least the way I remember it. Those raises were presented, the "me too" is to maintain the separation between the supervisors and the patrolmen. That's the reason that these are the percentages that they are at. With all that is going on relative to the crime and the drug traffic here locally I for one would not prefer to see the supervisor's being concerned about trying to take this to court or arbitration, I'd rather them be concentrating on what's going on in the streets and preventing crime.

Alderman Moriarty

I may be wrong because I often am but I'll suggest a couple of things. The last time I had a conversation with, it was off the record but it was with one of the managers in the police department, every single one of the employees who left was due to retirement. Let me rephrase that. There were twenty people that we were talking about within this bargaining unit that left and not one single one of these policemen left due to a reduction in pay or that they weren't getting paid enough. Every single one of them left due to retirement. It is a fair portrayal to say that in a large...most, if not all of the employees within the police department does not leave because of higher pay they leave because they are retiring. It is also a fair portrayal to characterize our police department as extremely high quality and one of the best in the country, they are very ethical. People look forward to working here to the extent such that there are often times 200 people applying for a handful of positions. Combine the two things, one; people want to move here and work here and policemen want to work in this department to such an extent that there are 200 to 4 and once they get here they don't get here until they retire. We do not have a problem retaining police; that is a fallacy. The second thing, now let's get back to the simplicity of the contract, we can vote no and it can be rejected and this "me too" clause that everyone is referring to is on page 27, it's Article 28 and it's a paragraph that says that "however in the event subordinates receive a higher cost of lean raise then the employees covered by this agreement the same percentage increase shall also be extended to the bargaining unit." There is a paragraph in this particular contract that makes it mutually exclusive, it implies a constraint. If we vote no based on the numbers, we are not allowed to vote based on the paragraph itself but we are allowed to vote no based on the numbers. If we reject the contract simply because of business and the affordability of it, it is not our problem for them to figure out how to solve it. The police commissioners will have to realize that they will not be able to include that paragraph, they will have to remove that paragraph in order to make the numbers meet our concerns. We have the ability to vote no and make our decision on the vote be purely cost because we can only vote on cost items. We, the Board of Aldermen, can retain our authority to vote no and it will indeed end up in a savings contrary to what other Aldermen might have suggested earlier.

Alderman Schoneman

I want to add that although we did vote unanimously at the Budget Review Committee meeting, it was not a good feeling vote. I share the view that this contract is not really good, it's not. I also share the view that it is inevitable and it sends us into a very difficult position when it comes to budget time. The police department has been good in the past at hitting the number they have been assigned. In fact, they were very good at it last year and we bumped them up to reward them for that and I don't think that was a wise thing to do. We even paid them more than they were requesting initially. Here we are heading into a season where they are asking for 2.5% and that's the guidance that they have been given. We've already heard that schools are going to around 2.0% and everyone else is 1.3%. There's no way the city overall can meet that 1.3% spending cap with those kinds of percentages that exceed when everyone else is 1.3% without cutting services somewhere. It brings me back to the problem or to what Mayor Lozeau pointed out in last years' budget meeting where we saw taxes ramping up, we saw salaries ramping up, we saw pensions ramping up and we saw services flat-lined. That is a picture of decreasing value, costs go up and services stay the same. If value is defined as you get what for what you spend as the cost of that goes up and the services stay flat-lined the value is decreasing. We are continuing that trend. To approve this contract continues and heads us deeper into that direction, nevertheless, it does seem to be inevitable for the reasons that were discussed. I want to point out that I am in agreement with Alderman Moriarty that there is no turnover to the best of knowledge for anything other than retirement. The issue was not a potential loss of police employees on the past contracts, it was the fact that there were fewer applicants than we had in the past and in order to keep the stack as high as it was and as rich as it was we wanted to make sure that we drew the best applicants but there is no danger of turnover and to pretend that there is I think is certainly unwise. These contracts are all problematic; every single one of them with the exception of maybe the para's that we talked about earlier and the food service. We are simply spending too much money, we are spending more than taxpayers have allotted and certainly more than they are getting in their own increases on their own private sector salaries and we are heading towards a significant problem. It did pass unanimously but sadly I must say because we are heading further

down the path that Mayor Lozeau pointed out last year of increased costs for flat-lined services and a loss of value.

Alderman Clemons

I've heard a lot spoken tonight about the spending cap. I want to address that at least for constituents who elected me to represent them. I did not run with a pledge of upholding the spending cap. The spending cap was put into place in 1995 and it's gone up with inflation so if you think of it in those terms we are spending 1995 dollars in 2016. For a city this size and that has grown in different ways; we have a more diverse population than we had in 1995, we have different struggles particularly that the police department has to deal with than they had to in 1995 and yet here we are arguing about whether or not these gentlemen should get raises that essentially would be the equivalent of raising their pay with 1995 dollars. I don't think it is fair and I don't think it is right. That's my opinion and the voters at least in Ward 6 didn't vote for me to come into office to make sure that everything would fall under the spending cap. They wanted me to use my judgement and my judgement is that we need to make sure that our police department is taken care of so that people like Alderman Moriarty said, want to come and work in Nashua and so that people want to stay in Nashua and retire in Nashua because if we don't do that then what is going to happen is we are not going to get the top quality candidates that we have gotten in the past and that's going to affect our crime rate and everything thereon down. For those reasons I am going to vote for this contract regardless of the spending cap because I don't believe the spending cap should come into discussions because I think it is something that is strangling the city.

Alderman O'Brien

I would just like to throw out an air of caution. To say that people retire just to retire may not necessarily be true. There's a whole host of reasons why an employee choses to retire. It could be health reasons or something else that is going on in their particular life or maybe we are not paying them enough and they are seeking employment. To that end we do have a Board of Police Commissioners that did due diligence negotiating with this particular union. They brought us back a contract for us to approve. I am going to vote in support of it but if we shoot this down then may I recommend to come join with me and let's roll up our sleeves and sharpen our pencils and do the work of the police commission or are we going to trust a duly appointed Board that brings back negotiations from an organization whether it be the Board of Fire Commissioners or the Board of Public Works or whoever is up on their contracts. I understand that we do have the right to shoot it down despite what other people think but again, I would not say as a complete blanket statement that people retire just to retire, they retire for a whole host of reasons and we have to respect the individuality and maybe we need to look at what age these people are retiring at. If they are getting out at the first opportunity then maybe something is wrong and we need to look at it. That has not been brought up by this Board because we are not sitting here with the negotiations so maybe we need to be a little bit more active and take a look at what is the particular reason.

Alderman Lopez

I would like to speak in support of the police because we've been talking mostly about the spending cap. Alderman Siegel made some good points about the potential of our vote tonight doing nothing but signaling to the police that we put a dollar value on their service and then ultimately having to pay them anyway. There is that concern but I would like to acknowledge more along the line of what Alderman Clemons was pointing out of not only do we have a heroin epidemic which has received a lot of publicity and public support from my fellow Aldermen and the Mayor a commitment to do something about it. I don't think it's a good time to necessarily start cutting back on our number one tool to address that. The Public Health Department is very effective. Numerous community organizations are also stepping up with trying to help with prevention and recovery but the police department are the ones that are dealing with the emergency calls and issuing the Narcan and dealing with the emergency situations that arise. They are usually our first line of response so making sure that they are coordinated and trained and overseen by qualified, competent supervisors I think is a major priority for our city. I recognize what Alderman Moriarty said about the pieces of the pie and you can't

cut everything exactly the same and have the same size pie if everything is suddenly bigger but I think we should take a more careful look at prioritizing which pieces need to be bigger for the given situation that we find ourselves in. I do know that over the last year or two that the Nashua Police Department has shown a lot of leadership, particularly in working with the minority communities. New Hampshire has the second largest number of trained police officers and that is, in part, due to Nashua's leadership. That's a badge of honor for us and when I say trained I mean trained in dealing with minorities and youth intervention. New Hampshire is one of the only states in the country that has a positive change in minority incarceration. In other words we have less minority youth showing up in the criminal justice system. There are plenty programs that are working to provide after school care and court diversion and all that kind of stuff but the people who deal with the situations when they deal with youth and minorities first in the legal system is the police officers so making sure that they are well trained and well supervised and part of a program that reflects the needs of our community is where my Ward and voters I think are most interested. I personally am supporting this and I hope the other Aldermen do too because our police do a very good job and we don't want to cut it back to the point where they are no longer doing a good job, we want to keep them doing a good job.

Alderman LeBrun

I too have the greatest respect for our police department. We do have a quality police department and I also have respect for a subcommittee and the Budget Review Committee did a good job on this, they came back with a unanimous vote to accept this contract and for that reason I will support it.

Alderman Schoneman

I wanted to make clear if I didn't before that I have full confidence in our police department, I think it's an excellent force. I thank Heaven every day that we have an excellent police department. The issue has nothing to do with the quality of the force, in fact, it's a quality force and whatever their pay was they will continue to be a quality force and that's because they have good character. The issue is just that it's very hard for these contracts to grow and maintain services because the spending cap is real. It's a guideline where in a system where there is no market competition, no force is at play, there has to be some measure for growth and the growth that was determined by voters here in the city and reaffirmed a couple of years ago produces a formula that says that the growth in public spending will match the growth of private spending and presumably private income growth so that's the problem.

Alderman McGuinness

I voted for the contract on Thursday night. Alderman Schoneman is correct, it wasn't really all that happy; it was more of a reluctant vote. The arguments there that this is going to happen anyway resonated with everyone and I will acknowledge that from what I understand some of the negotiations that went on in preparing this contract, we did get some concessions with insurance and vacation time and I know that Deputy Chief Michael Carignan worked very hard on that but the fact remains that it's way over the cap. I did vote for it and I think we have the finest police department in the State of New Hampshire. Some of my concerns were the disparity between the patrolmen's contract and supervisor's contract and you want to make sure there is a spread there...that's legitimate to me. I think it's an argument of merit. I don't want to see the supervisor's being penalized because they are in positions of management and authority. Alderman Clemons, I did run on a position that I would not go over the spending cap and that's important to me. I understand what Alderman Moriarty is saying, it's all one pie, some get more and some get less. We all know what hit the paper on Monday, every citizen in Nashua knows that the school budget is going to be way over so where are we going from here? I started to think after reading that article and perhaps I could be persuaded otherwise. Again, I don't want to take anything away from the finest police department in the State of New Hampshire and I respect what the chief and the deputy chief had done as well as some of the commissioners but I am having considerations right now of flipping my vote.

Alderman Cookson

Attorney Bennett, there were some comments made earlier by some of my colleagues or at least one of them that raised concern in my mind and I just want for clarification sake, to make sure that we as a Board of Aldermen know what our responsibilities are with regard to the contract before us. The Board of Aldermen is not a negotiating Board and we do not roll up our sleeves and we do not have the ability to negotiate with any one of the unions that come before us with a collective bargaining agreement. Is that a correct statement?

Attorney Bennett

That's correct.

Alderman Cookson

I understand the enthusiasm, I think when I began close to 12 years ago that's exactly the kind of thing that I wanted to do but we as a Board of Aldermen do not have that capacity. As Aldermen O'Brien said, it's the fire commissioners, the police commissioners and the public works; they are the ones that are responsible for negotiating the contracts and corporation counsel represents the city within those negotiations. I think it's also important to distinguish, especially this evening, because there is a lot of deliberation that's going on and that is that Alderman Siegel and Alderman Moriarty have made points about the spending cap and staying within the spending cap and clauses and such. We as a Board of Aldermen have the responsibility to do one of three things with regard to this contract this evening, we can approve the contract and all of its cost items, we can reject the contract and all of its cost items or we can approve the contract but reject some of the cost items. Attorney Bennett, is that an accurate statement?

Attorney Bennett

It's accurate except for the last one; you can't approve the contract and reject certain items. If you reject certain items or the entire contract then it goes back and they can accept it without the rejected items or renegotiate. It doesn't go to arbitration.

Alderman Cookson

No, it would go back to the police commissioners and they would determine whether they agree with the cost items that were rejected.

Attorney Bennett

As well as the membership of the union.

Alderman Cookson

Correct.

Alderman Siegel

I'd like to thank my colleague, Alderman O'Brien, for pointing out the nature of retirement. Retirement has a connotation in many peoples' minds that you reach a certain age and you can no longer work. Often time's retirement means I am now eligible to receive a pension and I'm going to take advantage of it because I can receive greater compensation elsewhere. That is an important distinction. As far as the line items of the contract, the tallest pole and the far more significant one is the one that has the "me too" clause. That is the major cost items in this contract and so if that's the thing...we don't really have a lot of giveback flexibility. One could argue whether or not we would win if we went to arbitration but I honestly believe and I believe the commissioners believe that that is not something we have much ability to change right now. Since that is the



tall pole everything else we could accept or reject but it's somewhat irrelevant financially for the most part. I would strongly urge that this Board vote for a contract even though like many of us we are not entirely happy with the numbers.

Alderman O'Brien

My last statement on this matter in support is something nobody here has brought up and you have different unions within the police department and one of them is the Patrolmen's Association and eventually in time they come in and they bring in their contract and we approve or disapprove and they come up but it's the fact that it's called compression and it very much exists. When you bring in the patrolmen's contract it comes in and it compresses against the supervisor's contract and it eventually gets to the point that you say here and some people threw the blanket statement out that maybe there's no big reason but when you have a compression on the salaries coming up from the bottom from the patrolmen's it can go against the "why would you really want to become a supervisor if you are making almost the same basic pay grade" and that's something that I don't have an answer for without looking at a comparison but it's something that I think we need to be aware of. The reason that the supervisor's come in with the dollar amount that they are looking for is to guard against that compression factor.

I would also like to thank Attorney Bennett for his service but also for one of his last rulings and I do agree with you, thank you.

Alderman Dowd

I did talk to Chief Lavoie and as was stated earlier he fully supports this contract and fully understands the cost of the contract as part of his budget and has already allocated that into it. He feels strongly that the support of his leadership team is vitally important to his department. I think we ought to pass this contract.

Alderman Schoneman

I voted for this contract in the Budget Review Committee because of its inevitability and I don't see any point in not supporting it now. I asked Chief Lavoie if this was going to be contained within their 1.3% spending cap number and then we find out that it's 2.5%. So, yes it is included in a budget number that is double what the spending cap allows. At some stage if you are given enough anything can be covered. It's a painful support because it paints us into a corner and it's going to cause us trouble later.

Alderman Siegel

In addressing Alderman O'Brien's roll up your sleeves remark, there is one way we can save significant amounts of money for our police department and that's that you can negotiate with the criminals and you can see if they might be willing to do less crimes because then we would have less expense. So there's a way that you can direct your energy.

A Viva Voce Roll Call vote was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea:	Alderman Clemons, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron, Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy	9
Nay:	Alderman Deane, Alderman Cookson, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman Moriarty	6

**MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-16-009 declared duly adopted.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – ORDINANCES – None

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-16-010**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd

**AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY TREASURER TO INCREASE THE BOND AUTHORIZATION FOR ROAD AND TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS ON AMHERST STREET BETWEEN CHARRON AVENUE AND DIESEL ROAD AND ISSUE BONDS NOT TO EXCEED THE AMOUNT OF ONE MILLION FOUR THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$1,004,000)**

Given its first reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO ACCEPT THE FIRST READING OF R-16-010 BY ROLL CALL, REFER IT TO THE BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE AND THAT A PUBLIC HEARING BE SCHEDULED FOR MONDAY, MARCH 28, 2016, AT 7:00 PM IN THE ALDERMANIC CHAMBER**

A Viva Voce Roll Call vote was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane, Alderman Cookson, 12  
Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron, Alderman Siegel,  
Alderman Schoneman, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun,  
Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy

Nay: Alderman Moriarty 1

**MOTION CARRIED**

**R-16-011**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Don LeBrun  
Alderman Sean M. McGuinness

**RELATIVE TO THE ACCEPTANCE AND APPROPRIATION OF UP TO AN ADDITIONAL \$62,000 FROM THREE PROPERTY OWNERS AS CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD THE ROAD AND TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS ON AMHERST STREET BETWEEN CHARRON AVENUE AND DIESEL ROAD**

Given its first reading; assigned to the BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE by President McCarthy

**R-16-012**

Endorser: Alderman-at-Large Daniel T. Moriarty  
**AUTHORIZING PENNICHUCK CORPORATION, PENNICHUCK WATER WORKS, INC., PENNICHUCK EAST UTILITY, INC., AND PITTSFIELD AQUEDUCT COMPANY, INC. TO BORROW FUNDS FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING LOAN FUND**

Given its first reading; assigned to the PENNICHUCK WATER SPECIAL COMMITTEE by President McCarthy

**R-16-013**

Endorser: Alderman-at-Large Daniel T. Moriarty  
**AUTHORIZING PENNICHUCK CORPORATION AND PENNICHUCK EAST UTILITY, INC. TO ENTER INTO A LONG TERM LOAN WITH COBANK**

Given its first reading; assigned to the PENNICHUCK WATER SPECIAL COMMITTEE by President McCarthy

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES

**O-16-004**

Endorser: Alderman Benjamin Clemons  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien  
Alderman Thomas Lopez  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman-at-Large Brian S. McCarthy

**EXTENDING HOURS OF SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES BY ON-PREMISES LICENSEES**

Given its first reading; assigned to the PERSONNEL/ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE by President McCarthy

**O-16-005**

Endorser: Alderman David Schoneman

**REMOVING THREE PARKING SPACES ON LOWELL STREET FROM THE PERMITTED OVERNIGHT ON-STREET PARKING PROGRAM**

Given its first reading; assigned to the COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE by President McCarthy

PERIOD FOR GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT - None

REMARKS BY THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN

Alderman Moriarty

The difference between budgets, salary contracts and the number of employees, it's actually sort of ironic and somewhat counterproductive the way we want to do things. If you want to fight crime you feel like you want to have a lot of police, you do want to have a lot of police if you want to fight crime. When you have a contract that you pass to have a high pay increase the contract isn't to grow the number of policemen, what that contract does is it makes each individual employee more expensive. You can argue whether or not you have a limited amount of funds in a budget or not but let's just assume that there is a limited amount of dollars to spend on a budget, if you believe that there is a limited amount of dollars to spend then the number of employees that you are able to hire actually goes up if the cost of each employee does not go up. Basically you can either have more employees or more expensive employees but you can't have more, more expensive employees at the same time, the math doesn't up. When you think you want to fight crime what you really want is more police not more expensive police. The irony of passing a contract that creates more expensive police; what you may find downstream maybe this year or the next year is that staff actually gets either reduced or doesn't grow so you actually have a harder time fighting crime. Think about that, that's it.

Alderman LeBrun

In the absence of the Mayor, I would like to thank the Mayor for the breakfast at Nashua North on Friday. It was very informative and there were many city officials there as well as state representatives.

Alderman Schoneman

I want to remind folks if they are interested that the City of Nashua is conducting an Emergency Preparedness Training session on two consecutive Saturdays this coming Saturday, February 27<sup>th</sup> and the following on March 5<sup>th</sup> from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and will be held in Ward 3 at the Gate City Church. It's free and you can find out information on the city website or the church's website which is [gatecitychurch.org](http://gatecitychurch.org).

Alderman Siegel

To address Alderman Moriarty's sense of economics and putting on my CEO hat, by extension one could draft an army of poodles not subject to the minimum wage and put a poodle on every street corner because it would be fairly cheap. There's a reason that you balance the salaries that you pay people with the worth and the quality of the expected work that you are going to get. Let's be very careful when we look at the economics behind hiring and how wages are defined. I have to deal with this every day and I bet my own money on those decisions.

Alderman Caron

I would like to send condolences to the John Barry family. John was a member of the Parks & Recreation Department as the operations manager for over ten years and he was a well-respected person.

Alderman Dowd

I would like to give my congratulations to Attorney Bennett for all of his service that he has provided to the city. I wish you well in everything you do going forward.

The other thing is just a little explanation about the Amherst Street/Charron Avenue; the original estimate that we had proposed, and I'm sure the Mayor would have addressed it had he been here, when we finally got the bids last fall they came in significantly higher and we took some actions in the design to get the cost down but it still came in above the projected amount and this is a project where it's a public/private partnership and at the time of the original bid half of the cost was being covered by the people that owned the businesses in the area and that's unheard of and they don't have to do that. This work on Amherst Street and Charron Avenue we could be doing totally on city dollars. We called the companies in and we already knew they were at the limit and they agreed to give us an additional \$62,000 towards the project and they are stretching their budgets significantly because they would like to have it done. The additional bonding that is required is the additional city portion of the funding to make this project fully funded so we can start it as soon as the weather improves.

Alderman Clemons

I would like to take this opportunity to wish Attorney Bennett all of the best. It was always a pleasure to work with you and you have served the city very well and I thank you for all of your hard work and service. Too often it goes unnoticed but it hasn't gone unnoticed by anyone around here.

Alderman Lopez

On March 19<sup>th</sup> at 11:00 a.m. at Greeley Park there is a community organized walk for heroin awareness. Anybody who knows someone who has overdosed or passed away or anyone that has been affected by it is welcome. I was also asked by a constituent to invite the Board of Aldermen.

President McCarthy

I would also like to extend my thanks to Attorney Bennett for his service to the city. It's been a great pleasure working with you for more years than I care to remember.

I would also like to extend my condolences to the Barry family. John was good to work with as well and he did a lot of work for the city.

I have been attending the New Hampshire Science Café for the last year or so which brings in panels on a highly diverse set of topics. The one last week was on opioid addiction and I found it fascinating enough that I am trying to arrange the same panel in to talk to the Board at a Human Affairs Committee meeting. The panel we had last week consisted of a doctor, a first responder from AMR, a former pharmacist who now works for

the state law enforcement agencies and a pharmacist who in fact lost his son to a heroin overdose. I'd like to try to start getting some information in front of this Board. While I don't know that there's much we directly can do because we are not going to arrest our way out of this problem and we are probably not going to legislate our way out of it at the city level but I think it's important for us to understand what can and can't be done to encourage our state delegation to do the things that can and should be done to help the problem and understand where we can use the city's resources to help to solve it because it is a problem that will go nowhere but up if we do nothing about it.

Secondly, it never ceases to amaze me how resourceful scams can get. My wife picked up the phone this afternoon and a young women's voice said "hi, grandma, I was picked up by the police after having one glass of wine and they are holding me for DWI and I've been assigned a public defender and can he call you to figure out how to send my bail money? We don't have any grandchildren yet. The young woman said she would have the public defender call her back so my wife said to have her call back on my cell and the number is 594-3500 which is the number to the police department switch board number. Don't assume anything when you get random phone calls. If somebody pretends they know you then test them.

Committee announcements:

Alderman Cookson

We will have an Infrastructure Committee meeting tomorrow evening, the 24<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. in these Chambers. We had expected O-16-005 to be referred to the committee so that will be on tomorrow evenings agenda as well.

Alderman Dowd

Thursday evening is the JSSB meeting at the high school. There will not be school construction meeting and we just have some invoices that we have to approve so it should not be a long meeting.

Alderman Clemons

On March 7<sup>th</sup> we will have Personnel & Administrative Affairs Committee meeting at 7:00 p.m. here in the Chamber.

Alderman McCarthy

This Thursday is the grand opening of Makelt Labs on Crown Street in one of the buildings that the city purchased for the park and ride space. It's at 6:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS THAT THE FEBRUARY 23, 2016, MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN BE ADJOURNED**  
**MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

Attest: Patricia D. Piecuch, City Clerk